601
195

Table 2

Aboriginal Washo Kinship Terms:

Polite Affinal Terms[a]

English	Washo	Literal translation
son-in-law.	le?élel? dagóy? (m. sp.)	daughter's child's father;
	legú?yu? dagóy? (w. sp.)	daughter's child's father
daughter-in-law. .	lebé·ɓa? dalí? (m. sp.)	son's child's mother;
	legú?yu? dalí? (w. sp.)	son's child's mother
father-in-law . . .	dibumé·li? dagóy? (w. sp.)	husband's father
wife's brother. . .	digá?miŋ dadí?a	children's mother's brother
husband's brother.	digá·m de?éwši?	son's father's brother
sister's husband. .	dimé·gu dagóy?	sister's child's father
	di?í·sa? bumé·li?	older sister's husband
brother's wife. . .	dimáš dalí? (m. sp.)	brother's child's mother
brother's wife. . .	dišémuk dalí? (w. sp.)	brother's child's mother

[a] Source: Freed, 1960, 358.

177
178 that the shift has been gradual, with each adjustment a relatively minor one
231 when contrasted to the stage immediately preceding it.

On the other hand, the adjustments needed to adopt animal husbandry as a basic or even important adjunct to the Washo economy would have required at one time or another a major shift in orientation, the abandonment of certain aboriginal practices, and the adoption of many new skills and values. This major shift the Washo did not make, continuing instead their gradual adjustment to changing conditions until they became inextricably involved in the socio-economic system of the area, and no longer in a position to undertake any large scale experiments in husbandry.

124
231 In questioning informants about domestic animals and the earlier relationships between domestic animals and the Washo, one trend becomes increasingly clear. The Washo are for the most part uncomfortable when involved in such a conversation. Description of the details of their behavior in this regard must perhaps await psychological testing, but it is clear that for the most part this is an experience they find uninteresting and unpleasant.

231
825 The explanation of this attitude may well lie in that area of Washo
773 culture which appears to have survived most completely. The Washo world
[778] view and related attitudes about the supernatural and the nature of the world
[177] are clearly aboriginal and have been little affected by white contact (Downs,
[171] 1961b). An integral part of these aspects of Washo culture is a view of the nature of the animals man encounters in this world.

The Washo view of the animal kingdom is similar to that of many other Indian tribes in the West. Animals are the product of acts of creation essentially similar to that which produced man. At one time the prototypes of the animals lived as part of the human social system, conversing and interacting with mankind. As essentially the same class of being as man, animals are subject to many of the same laws as man, and are the possessors of power. Thus, to be a successful hunter one must have more power than the animals he hunts and at the same time he must propitiate them so that they will allow themselves to be killed for mankind's benefit. Thus the Washo view animals as a combination of fellow, powerful magician, and willing sacrifice. As such, animals must be treated with respect and viewed with awe.

● 195
825 Much of this attitude is summed up in the Washo usage of the word
231 <u>muelge</u>, which in its simplest translation means wild beast or dangerous beast. However, further probing of the many connotations of the word reveals that this is applied to any hunted animal, large or small, which eludes or outwits the hunter. Thus a bear is inherently muelge, but a deer, or even a squirrel, is muelge only if he manages to show his superiority to

the hunter or more particularly to the hunter's medicine. Moreover, musëge is also applied to men who displayed aggressive power as hunters, warriors or in modern times, men who are bad-tempered. Finally, musëge is the common Washo term used in reference to the most powerful and dangerous and inexplicable of animals, the white man. By extension the attitude appears to cover also the white man's livestock -- large, often dangerous animals that destroy wild plant foods, and for whose control are required new (and difficult to acquire) skills. The Indian's fear of domestic animals when he was first confronted with horses and cattle is clear from Cortez's invasion of the 16th century to the Blackfeet in the 18th and 19th centuries (Ewers, 1955), and the Pit River tribes of the 1860's and 70's, (de Angulo, 1950). If we recall that Washo enmity toward white men -- the commercial sheep grazers who lease the pinenut allotment lands, for instance -- is apt to be couched in terms of hostility toward the sheep rather than the sheep herder, we see yet another extension of this admittedly vague but nonetheless real identification of animals and men. In short, the white man and his animals appear never to have been clearly distinguished from one another. Moreover the ritual or magical skills of aboriginal Washo life, which enabled the Washo to deal with the native fauna, were of no use in dealing with domestic livestock. One cannot view a sheep or cow or horse as semisacred and at the same time carry out the tasks necessary to the proper conduct of husbandry. At this point the example of Hindu India, where the cow is considered so sacred that the millions of bovines on the subcontinent cannot contribute their full potential to the welfare of human society, may help illustrate the point I am attempting to make about the Washo. Essentially what has happened in the Washo case is that the Washo have not succeeded in making a clear distinction between domestic animals and wild animals, and therefore, have not been able to adjust their own behavior in terms of domestic-wild categories. This failure to draw these distinctions has made it difficult for the Washo to undertake any real husbandry activities.

However, in the final paragraphs of this paper, it might be well to see exactly what the Washo have or have not rejected. Clearly the Washo have not rejected or failed to incorporate domestic livestock. The Washo language borrowed or developed words for all the more common domestic animals. The Washo willingly eats beef, veal, pork, bacon or ham, although he tends to reject mutton and lamb. There are within Washo culture clear-cut patterns of behavior that direct actions concerning domestic animals. Moreover, in the recent past many Washo developed the skill necessary to ride and drive horses, although this skill was soon lost with the invention of the automobile. What the Washo failed to develop were the attitudes and skills necessary for animal husbandry as distinguished from "domestication" or "domestic animals."